

REMARKS

Claims 5-10 and 15 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 15 are amended and claim 11 is canceled. No new matter is added by this Amendment. Support for the language added to claim 1 can be found in original claim 11.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration (as the amendment to claim 5 merely incorporates the subject matter already searched and considered in original claim 11); (c) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (d) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 5-11 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,793,355 ("Youens").* This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant initially points out that the subject matter of original claim 11 has been incorporated into claim 5.

The Patent Office alleged that Youens teaches or suggests the features recited in claims 5-11 and 15. However, the Patent Office did not explain how Youens allegedly teaches or suggests that the portable terminal requires, during application start-up, for one or

* In the rejection, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office also referred to "Paolucci et al." with regard to Claim 15. This reference is believed to be a typographical error, and should refer to Youens. No rejections appear to have been made relying on Paolucci et al.

more of said control units to be selected and when one or more control units are selected, accepts input for an application from the selected control unit(s) as recited in amended claim 5. The Patent Office did allege that Youens teaches that the input program, when executed, causes the computer system to select one or more control units from the plurality of control units and makes input to be accepted in the portable terminal via the selected control unit at column 2, lines 15-35 and column 4, line 55 to column 5, line 11 of Youens. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Patent Office's allegations.

Youens is directed to a portable computer having interchangeable pointing device modules, such as a pointing stick module and a touchpad module. See column 1, lines 8-12 of Youens. Youens teaches that the pointing device is interchanged and selected prior to application start-up, not during application start-up as required in claim 5. The sections of Youens introduced by the Patent Office as allegedly teaching the features recited in amended claim 5, merely teach installing an interchangeable pointing device module.

The specification clearly explains that the control unit 200 is selected for use as an input device by the application to be executed. If an application has been started, the system displays a prompt asking the user to select one or more control units from out of the available control units mounted in the sockets. See page 20, line 23 to page 21, line 10 of the specification. This selection is described in greater detail in the specification at page 20, line 23 to page 21, line 21.

It is clear from this explanation that the control units are selected after an application has been started and are selected from control units that are mounted in the portable terminal. Applicant thus submits that Youens does not teach or suggest that the portable terminal requires, during application start-up, for one or more of said control units to be selected and when one or more control units are selected, accepts input for an application from the selected control unit(s) as recited in claim 5.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that Youens does not teach or suggest all of the features recited in claims 5-10 and 15. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are thus respectfully requested.

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 5-11 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,865,546 ("Ganthier") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,104,604 ("Anderson"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Patent Office alleged that Ganthier teaches all of the features recited in claims 5-11 and 15 except for having a modular control unit within a portable terminal. The Patent Office thus introduced Anderson as allegedly teaching this feature. The Patent Office further alleged that Ganthier teaches that the portable terminal requires, during application start-up, for one or more of said control units to be selected and when one or more control units are selected, accepts input for the application from the selected control unit(s) as recited in claim 5 at column 3, lines 15-35. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Patent Office's allegations.

Ganthier teaches that a keyboard controller, in conjunction with the computer's host processor, loads appropriate software drivers for controlling the operation of each input device module, as would be known by those of ordinary skill in the art. See column 6, lines 15-19 of Ganthier. The keyboard controller also determines the type of input device module when an input device module is replaced while the computer is powered on. However, Applicant submits that Ganthier does not teach or suggest that the portable terminal accepts input for a particular application from the selected control unit(s) as required in claim 5.

Furthermore, as explained above, the specification explains that the control unit is selected for use as an input device by the application to be executed, is selected after an application has been started, and is selected from control units that are mounted in the

portable terminal. See page 20, line 23 to page 21, line 21 of the specification. In contrast, Ganthier merely teaches loading appropriate drivers for controlling an input device module, not selecting control units during application start-up and accepting input for an application from the selected units.

Anderson was introduced as allegedly teaching a modular control unit within a portable terminal. However, Anderson does not remedy the deficiencies of Ganthier. Specifically, Anderson does not teach or suggest that the portable terminal requires, during application start-up, for one or more of said control units to be selected and when one or more control units are selected, accepts input for the application from the selected control unit(s) as recited in claim 5.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that Ganthier and Anderson, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the features recited in claims 5-10 and 15. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are thus respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 5-10 and 15 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

Leana Levin

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Leana Levin
Registration No. 51,939

JAO:LL/rav

Date: April 4, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;

Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461